

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Rayyan for the telephonic interview of July 2, 2007, during which claim amendments were discussed.

Based on the amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the office action, claims 1–11, 13–25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kirsch (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,158). In addition, claims 12 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch in view of Olstad (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0032772).

In response to the office action, claims 1, 13, 19 and 27 have been currently amended. In light of the above claim amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are distinct, and therefore, patentable over the cited art.

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1–11, 13–25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kirsch (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,158).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

an infrequent word identifier that identifies infrequent words that occur in less than a threshold number of documents, an infrequent word being a word queried less often than a frequent word; (bolding added for emphasis)

Claim 13 has been amended to recite:

scanning the set of documents and gathering infrequent words that occur fewer times than a threshold number in the set of documents, **an infrequent word being a word queried less often than a frequent word**; (bolding added for emphasis)

Claim 19 has been amended to recite:

identifying infrequent words that occur in less than a threshold number of documents **an infrequent word being a word queried less often than a frequent word**; (bolding added for emphasis)

Claim 27 has been amended to recite:

means for scanning the set of documents and gathering infrequent words that occur a number of times that is less than a threshold amount in a number of documents, **an infrequent word being a word queried less often than a frequent word**; (bolding added for emphasis)

Claims 1, 13, 19 and 27, as amended recite a clarifying element indicating an infrequent word is a word queried less often than a frequent word.

Kirsch states "Where the frequency of occurrence exceeds some threshold over some set of documents, the term can be added dynamically to the word stop list.

Subsequent occurrences of too frequently encountered terms are then effectively ignored." (col 10, lines 29–35)

Applicants' specification provides:

As discussed in the background, partitioning by document is a typical way of constructing document indexes. While this approach efficiently deals with words having a significant number of occurrences ("frequent" words), inefficiencies areas such as caching and I/O costs are introduced for words that occur infrequently ("infrequent" words). For example, infrequent words are located between frequent words, making caching the data less efficient since **infrequent words are typically queried less often than frequent words**. When pages of memory containing frequent words that are more often queried are moved into memory, **infrequent and therefore less useful words** are included in the pages, occupying valuable cache storage and offering little benefit. (pg 4, lines 7–14) (bolding added for emphasis)

3. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the numbers listed below prior to issuing a further Office Action.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 2007-07-02

By: /James Haugen, Reg. # 60056/

James Haugen, Reg. No.: 60,056
Agent for Applicants
Direct telephone: (425) 703-6636
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

July 2, 2007
Date

/Rimma N. Oks/
Signature

Rimma N. Oks
Type or Print Name

11

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/761,160
Attorney Docket Number: 305335.01
Filing Date: 01-20-2004